

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the specification, the paragraphs [0001], [0003] and [0016] have been amended to correct minor grammatical errors.

Claims 1-18 now remain in this application. Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. New claims 16-18 have been added.

Claims 1 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112.

No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The examiner alleges it is not clear which "output current control input", "output current monitoring port", and "control output" are intended, since the specification (allegedly) fails to show the claimed subject matters.

Claim 9, page 13, lines 18-19 and page 14, line 1, the examiner alleges that it is not clear which "the output current" is intended since there are "output current control input" and "output current monitoring port" recited in the claims.

With regard to the Examiner's remarks concerning the lack of clarity as to "which 'output current control input', 'output current monitoring port' and 'control input' are intended", the following is offered as clarification.

The element "output current control input" is the line or input to the power amplifier 119 that is connected to the output of the amplifier 355, while the element "control output" is the output of the amplifier 355 itself. Therefore, the Examiner is correct in that the same signal is present in both elements.

However, they are different elements because, although connected together, the one is the output of the amplifier 355 while the other is the input to the power amplifier 119. That is why they are recited separately in the claims.

The element "output current monitoring port" is the port 119b of the power amplifier 119, while the element "second input" is the input 335b of the feedback loop 335. Therefore, the Examiner is correct in that the same signal is present in both elements. However, they are different elements because, although connected together, the one is an monitoring port of the amplifier 119 while the other is an input to the feedback loop 335. That is why they are recited separately in the claims.

The Examiner's objection to Claim 9 at page 13 lines 18-19 and page 14 line 1 has been addressed by amending this portion of Claim 19 to read, "is a function of a difference between said envelope signal and the current at said monitoring port of said power amplifier".

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-15 are held to be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and therefore Claims 2-8 and 10-15 are allowable as depending from Claims 1 and 9.

SUMMARY

In view of the foregoing corrections and remarks, it is felt that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, have been overcome. Therefore, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested and allowance of the application is earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, the Examiner should telephone Robert Wallace at (805) 644-4035 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,



Dated: March 28, 2005

Robert M. Wallace
Reg. No. 29,119
Attorney for Applicants

Robert M. Wallace
Patent Attorney
2112 Eastman Avenue, Suite 102
Ventura, CA 93003
(805) 644-4035